	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/047,014	SANTORI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ba Huynh	2179	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Ba Huynh*.   (3)_____.

(2) *Mark S. Williams*.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *12 October 2005*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
       c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
   If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *1*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *Washington et al*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☒ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In claim 1, the negative limitation "wherein said executing the first graphical data flow program and said executing the second data flow program are performed without invocation of the first and second graphical data flow program by a third graphical data flow program" lacks of support from the specification. The applicant proposes an amendment to indicate that the second graphical data flow program is created using a second graphical development software program different than the first graphical program development software application. The amendment is to distinguish from Washington and Kodosky's teaching of executing graphical program having sub-VI.